

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/544,259

Applicant(s)

ALTENSCHOPFER ET AL.

Examiner

S. Tran

Art Unit

1615

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) S. Tran.

(3) John Cord

(5) Thomas S. Hefed

(2) Steve Reiter.

(4) Andrew Mclean

Date of Interview: 24 February 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments ***.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicants pointed out the differences between the claimed invention and that of Effing. It was indicated that the 102(b) rejection by Effing will be withdrawn. However, patentability will be determined in view of the newly found prior art, Miranda et al. Applicants will be contacted if there's allowable subject matter after reviewing the Amendment and Remarks.